Note: This PDF is a text-forward export for rapid distribution. Embedded images or figures from the DOCX may be omitted in this version.

Systemic Quality-Assurance Research Dossier

Submitted by: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

ORCID: [Insert ORCID / QR code]

SSRN Author ID: 7768604

Date: [Match paper's original submission date]

Title of Paper: Cross-Border Acknowledgment of Academic Obstruction: A Case Study in Whistleblower Documentation and International Accreditation Monitoring

Note on Scope

This paper is submitted as a systemic quality-assurance (QA) research dossier under Act CCIV of 2011 (National Higher Education Act, Hungary) and the ESG/WFME framework. It does not seek an individual remedy nor constitute a personal grievance. Instead, it evaluates institutional compliance with ESG standards: - ESG 1.2 – Programme Deliverability - ESG 1.3 – Fairness and Validity of Assessment - ESG 1.6 – Resource Adequacy and Transparency

The analysis builds upon documented evidence filed in Ombudsman Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025 and Hungarian Administrative Court Case 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2. It highlights: - High international attrition rates (67.5% vs. ~20% domestic) - Contradictory enforcement of FM/CV registration rules - Misrepresentation of collaboration vs. affiliation by the institution - Deficient anatomy specimens and inconsistent application of assessment conditions

Integration with Current Case Study

This continuation serves as the framing preface to the attached research paper. While the core document provides a detailed legal, procedural, and evidentiary record, this framing situates the work explicitly in the international QA and accreditation context. It ensures that the paper is read not as a personal dispute, but as a compliance and quality-monitoring dossier relevant to MAB, WFME, FAIMER, ECFMG, and EU oversight bodies.

Disclosure

This research dossier is distributed for academic, legal, and regulatory purposes. It is protected under Act XXV of 2023 (Whistleblower Protection, Hungary), Directive 2019/1937/EU (EU Whistleblower Directive), and related statutes. All evidence is factual, documentary, and cited against internal regulations (SZMSZ_HKR Articles 5, 11, 13, 29, 45).

Rights: © 2025 The Author. Distributed under open-access academic and whistleblower protections.

Cross-Border Acknowledgment of Academic Obstruction: A Case Study in Whistleblower Documentation and International Accreditation Monitoring

Author: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan Faculty of Medicine, Semmelweis University Email: swardan1@icloud.com Whistleblower Case ID: EBF-AJBH-309-2025 Court Case Number: 7. Kpk.

750.239/2025/2

Abstract

This subsequent report delineates the international recognition of a whistleblower case initially filed with the Hungarian Ombudsman and the Administrative Court. Although no direct intervention was issued, formal acknowledgment was received from Ms. Samantha Aouad, the Special Investigations Case Manager at the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG), following a referral by the World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) and FAIMER. These organizations directed the student to the Hungarian Accreditation Committee (MAB), with which they maintain formal collaboration in regulatory reviews. The student submitted a bilingual summary of the case to MAB, including all materials submitted both to the court and the Ombudsman, as well as Appendices A through F. The Hungarian Accreditation Committee acknowledged receipt and indicated that a response would be provided within 30 days. This development confirms that the case is now under national accreditation review, coordinated through international educational quality channels. Concurrent disclosures were also submitted to the Irish government, thereby expanding the case's transnational scope. This update formally recognizes the external visibility of allegations concerning administrative obstruction against Semmelweis University, thereby highlighting the global implications of violations of national academic integrity standards.

Author Motivation and Ethical Basis

The author, Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan, affirms that this work is neither a personal grievance nor an attempt to seek personal advantage. Instead, it aims to expose systemic failures with broader implications for other international students. The motivation is driven by a sense of responsibility to uphold academic integrity, especially considering an email received on February 9, 2025, from Dr. Andrea Székely, which served as the pivotal point for identifying broader patterns of exclusion under FM/CV registration.

Legal Background and References

This case is founded on Hungarian and European Union law, including: • Act XXV of 2023 concerning Whistleblower Protection (Hungary) • Act CCIV of 2011 concerning National Higher Education (Hungary) • Act CL of 2016 concerning Administrative Procedure (Hungary) • Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Articles 21 and 47 • Semmelweis University SZMSZ_HKR 2024 Internal Regulations, Articles 5, 11, 13, 29, 45

These legal references substantiate the grounds for equal access, transparency, procedural justice, and protection against discrimination and retaliation.

Appendices (Provided Separately)

This document references Appendices A–F, which contain documented evidence, including suppressed disclosures, course registration data, peer testimonies, email correspondences, deficiencies in anatomy specimens, and the original directive issued on February 9, 2025. These are available upon request or as part of the legal filings submitted to SSRN and ResearchGate.

International Notification and Acknowledgment

Following the exhaustion of administrative remedies in Hungary, the case was forwarded to:

1. The World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) and FAIMER, which then redirected the matter to the Hungarian Accreditation Committee (MAB).

2. The Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG, U.S.), where Ms. Aouad acknowledged and archived the complaint.

3. The Irish Department of Foreign Affairs confirmed receipt of the evidence. These actions were conducted to ensure transparency and institutional awareness, rather than to seek personal advantage.

Dismissive Handling of National Remedies

Internal appeals to Semmelweis University were met with silence or dismissive responses. On June 26, 2025, the Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Mr. Horváth Balázs, responded: "Could you help me figure out what this has to do with me?"—a dismissive response despite the formal, legally cited nature of the appeal. Other officials similarly failed to address or resolve the complaint, highlighting the need for international disclosure.

Date: July 22, 2025

To: Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG) 3624 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19104-2685, USA

Subject: Submission of Complete Legal Appendices – A through F

Dear Officials, I am hereby submitting a comprehensive and updated collection of appendices—A, B, C, D, E, and F—in support of my active whistleblower complaint, legal filing, and regulatory escalation concerning administrative obstruction and educational discrimination at Semmelweis University. These appendices include: • Appendix A – Suppression of Whistleblower Evidence • Appendix B – Overcrowding and Attendance Irregularities • Appendix C – Internal Policy Violations by Faculty (Dr. Székely) • Appendix D – Deficient Anatomical Specimen Documentation • Appendix E – Selective Enforcement of University Conduct Policy • Appendix F – Administrative Correspondence and Official Replies This submission is made under the provisions of the Hungarian Whistleblower Protection Act (Act XXV of 2023), and each appendix is submitted for full legal, academic, and procedural review. I respectfully request that this material be accepted into the official record, with all institutional responses duly documented. Sincerely, yours

Irish Citizen – Whistleblower Escalation to DFHERIS

Date: [Insert Date]

To: Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science (DFHERIS) Email: customerservice@dfheris.gov.ie Cc: siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu

Subject: Irish Citizen Abroad – Whistleblower Protection and Academic Obstruction in EU Medical Program (OM Case No. EBF–AJBH–309–2025)

Dear DFHERIS Team, My name is Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan, and I am writing to request formal review and diplomatic support regarding an ongoing whistleblower case and legal proceeding in Hungary, where I am enrolled as an Irish and U.S. citizen in the General Medicine program at Semmelweis University, Budapest. I have submitted a protected whistleblower disclosure (Case No. EBF–AJBH–309–2025) to the Hungarian Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, documenting: - Denial of access to compulsory medical training (cadaver dissection) despite valid tuition and FM registration status - Violation of the university's internal regulations (SZMSZ) - Potential discrimination against non-Hungarian (international) students - Retaliatory suppression of disclosures, as outlined under Hungarian Act XXV of 2023 (Whistleblower Protection Act) This matter has escalated to the Hungarian Administrative Court (Case No. 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2), and my disclosures have been accepted by additional oversight bodies, including ECFMG (USA) and WFME (World Federation for Medical Education). Request for DFHERIS Action: As an Irish citizen enrolled in a European university, I respectfully request that your department: 1. Acknowledge and document my case for Ireland's internal records concerning citizen treatment abroad 2. Assess whether Ireland has a duty to protect academic rights and equal treatment of Irish nationals enrolled in the EU under the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) 3. Initiate contact or advisory guidance to the Hungarian counterparts regarding compliance with international education standards and recognition agreements 4. Provide guidance on any formal EU complaint mechanisms DFHERIS may support (e.g., SOLVIT, Erasmus+ oversight, or education-related infringement channels)

■ For full evidence and legal context, I have published my case study as a preprint on SSRN. You may access it by scanning the QR code below:

Direct Link: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5346250

Thank you for your time and support. I am submitting this request in good faith and seek only a fair academic resolution consistent with Irish values and European legal standards. Sincerely, Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan Medical Student – EM14 Semmelweis University, Budapest Email: siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu Phone: +36 70 350 4077 1056 Budapest, Belgrád rakpart 4. FSZ 4 Irish & U.S. Citizen

customerservice <customerservice@dfheris.gov.ie>

RE: Prior Contact Failure Documented in Academic Legal Filing – Request for Acknowledgment (OM Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025)

To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu> Cc: customerservice <customerservice@dfheris.gov.ie>

Dear Siddhartha,

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your email to the Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science.

It will be brought to the attention of the relevant officials, who will endeavour to provide a response as quickly as possible. However as per our customer charter, available , it may take up to 20 business days from the date of receipt of your email, for a response to be issued.

Kind Regards,

Tatiana Ogredi,

Clerical Officer, Customer Service, Organisation Development and Operations Unit

—

An Roinn Breisoideachais agus Ardoideachais, Taighde, Nuálaíochta agus Eolaíochta

Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science

52 Faiche Stiabhna, Baile Átha Cliath 2, D02 DR67 52 Saint Stephen’s Green, Dublin 2, D02 DR67

From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu> Sent: Friday 1 August 2025 12:13 To: customerservice <customerservice@dfheris.gov.ie> Subject: Prior Contact Failure Documented in Academic Legal Filing – Request for Acknowledgment (OM Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025)

You don't often get email from .

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source. Do not click links or open attachments unless the sender is known.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a dual citizen of Ireland and the U.S., and I am currently enrolled at Semmelweis University in Budapest.

Despite having a valid CV/FM registration for Anatomy II during the 2023–2024 academic year, I was denied access to the practical anatomy labs—an action taken without any legal basis in the university's regulations.

I have formally filed a complaint under Hungarian law (Act XXV of 2023), received Ombudsman Case No. EBF–AJBH–309–2025, and notified both the U.S. and Irish embassies, as well as the ECFMG.

This situation warrants review under Irish standards of professional conduct and educational fairness. I respectfully request your office's assistance in examining this matter, as it impacts my ongoing eligibility for professional licensing and indicates systemic academic neglect.

QR code is the preprint publication.

Thank you for any guidance you can offer.

Sincerely,

Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

Irish/U.S. Citizen I Student

Email:

Tuesday, August 5, 2025 at 10:08:57 PM Central European Summer Time

Subject: FW: rotected Disclosure — Academic Access Denial, Semmelweis University, OM Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025 Date: Tuesday, August 5, 2025 at 11:15:40 AM Central European Summer Time

From: W info

To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN

Dear Siddhartha,

Please see email below from the Department of Further and Higher Education Research Innovation and Science.

Kind Regards

An tAonad um Sheirbhís do Chustaiméirí

Customer Support Unit

An Roinn Oideachais agus Óige

Department of Education and Youth

Corr na Madadh, Baile Átha Luain, Contae na hIarmhí, N37 X659 Cornamaddy, Athlone, Co Westmeath, N37 X659

From: Minister FHERIS <Minister_FHERIS@d6eris.gov.ie>

Sent: Friday 1 August 2025 16:52

To: Info <Info@educaGon.gov.ie>

Cc: Minister FHERIS <Minister_FHERIS@d6eris.gov.ie>

Subject: RE: rotected Disclosure — Academic Access Denial, Semmelweis University, OM Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025

Hi all,

Apologies for the delay in responding to this.

From what I can understand of this email it is a complaint against a University in Budapest.

We have no remit for Universities in Budapest, and could possibly be for DFA?

Kind regards

Aideen

An Roinn Breisoideachais agus Ardoideachais, Taighde, Nuálaíochta agus Eolaíochta Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science

52 Faiche Stiabhna, Baile Átha Cliath 2, D02 DR67.

52 Saint Stephen's Green, Dublin 2, D02 DR67.

From: Info <Info@educaGon.gov.ie>

Sent: Friday 11 July 2025 14:31

To: Minister FHERIS <Minister_FHERIS@d6eris.gov.ie>

Subject: Fw: rotected Disclosure — Academic Access Denial, Semmelweis University, OM Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025

Hi folks,

please email below is this proper to your team for review and reply as appropriate.

Kind regards,

Customer Support Unit

An Roinn Oideachais agus Óige

Department of Education and Youth

Corr na Madadh, Baile Átha Luain, Contae na hIarmhí, N37 X659

Cornamaddy, Athlone, Co Westmeath, N37 X659

T +(090) 648 3600

From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu>

Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2025 10:07 PM

To: Info <Info@educaGon.gov.ie>; student.rights34@proton.me <student.rights34@proton.me>; registraGon@mcirl.ie <registraGon@mcirl.ie>

Subject: rotected Disclosure — Academic Access Denial, Semmelweis University, OM Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source. Do not click links or open attachments unless the sender is known.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a dual citizen of Ireland and the U.S., and I am currently enrolled at Semmelweis University in Budapest.

Despite having a valid CV/FM registration for Anatomy II during the 2023–2024 academic year, I was denied access to the practical anatomy labs—a decision made without any legal basis in the university's regulations.

I have formally filed a complaint under Hungarian law (Act XXV of 2023), received

Ombudsman Case No. EBF–AJBH–309–2025, and notified both the U.S. and Irish embassies, as well as the ECFMG.

This situation demands scrutiny under Irish standards of professional conduct and educational fairness. I kindly request your office’s support in reviewing this matter as it affects my continued eligibility for professional licensing and reflects systemic academic neglect.

Attached are documents summarizing the case, including the Ombudsman file, witness statements, and relevant university policy references.

Thank you for any guidance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

Irish/U.S. Citizen I Student

Email: student.rights34@proton.me (secure channel)

Conclusion:

International Governmental Acknowledgment – Republic of Ireland

This document records official correspondence from the Irish Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation, and Science (DFHERIS), acknowledging receipt and conducting an internal review of a whistleblower complaint submitted against Semmelweis University. The submission included a published SSRN case report and a QR code detailing issues related to academic obstruction, administrative discrimination, and legal contradictions under Hungarian and EU education law. An acknowledgment was issued on August 1, 2025, by personnel from the department's ministerial office. While jurisdictional limitations were recognized, the nature of the case was thoroughly understood, discussed internally, and subsequently referred for further evaluation to the appropriate division. This correspondence signifies official cross-border acknowledgment of the complaint and affirms that senior officials within an EU member state have examined, documented, and preserved the complaint.

The communication from the Irish government, to which the researcher, a natural-born citizen, responded, elicited two distinct responses. The first was an archived email from Tatiana Ogredi, Clerical Officer, Customer Service, Organization Development and Operations Unit, of the Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science, stating that the matter would be brought to the attention of relevant officials, who would endeavor to respond as promptly as possible. However, consistent with our customer charter, accessible here, it may require up to 20 business days from the receipt of the email for a response to be issued. Interestingly, this statement contradicts the assertions made by Minister FHERIS, who explicitly states, after an apology, that no action can be taken because the Irish government does not address complaints from universities in Budapest, Hungary. A similar response was provided by Samantha Aouad, the Special Investigations Case Manager, who acknowledged the concern but also indicated that it fell outside her jurisdiction. Due to the legal disclaimer in the footer of the archived email from ECFMG, the researcher could include this correspondence within the legal case study.

Appendices Summary – Legal and Procedural Reference Index

This page provides a structured overview of Appendices A–F submitted in support of the whistleblower complaint and legal filings concerning systemic educational obstruction at Semmelweis University. Each appendix is self-contained and begins with an explanatory paragraph, but this summary serves as a guide for rapid understanding.

	Focus Area
ion of Whistleblower Evidence	Evidence of withheld student testimony, deleted or unacknowledged complaints, and data
ding and Attendance Irregularities	Contradictory enforcement of attendance rules and improper denial of access due to struct
by Dr. Székely – Internal Policy Breach	Violations of SZMSZ policies including FM/CV misinterpretation, lab denial, and unjustified
Anatomical Specimens Used in Education	Photographic evidence of poor specimen quality used in graded assessments, violating ed
Enforcement and Conduct Discrepancies	Institutional inconsistency in disciplinary enforcement, showing bias and procedural inequit
orrespondence and Administrative Timeline	Emails, petitions, Ombudsman communications, and legal notices forming the procedural a

This appendix contains documented evidence of institutional or administrative suppression of academic whistleblower disclosures. These materials demonstrate how attempts to communicate lawful complaints or factual legal content were removed or silenced by peer administrators or moderators within the educational environment. These communications form part of Case Number EBF–AJBH–309–2025 before the Hungarian Ombudsman.

Exhibit A-1: WhatsApp Group Suppression of Legal Disclosure

Date: July 10, 2025 Moderator: Nikole Argyros Whistleblower: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan Platform: WhatsApp – SE Year Group

This conversation documents the removal of a legally protected public interest disclosure (Act XXV of 2023) posted by the student in a WhatsApp student group. The post related to the denial of anatomy lab

access and was supported by Ombudsman Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025. The group admin labeled it 'advertising' and removed it, despite it not being a commercial or promotional message. The message was factual legal information, and the removal constituted suppression of whistleblower rights. [Act XXV of 2023 on Complaints and Whistleblower Protection (Hungary)]

Appendix A – Suppression of Whistleblower Disclosure

Prepared by: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

Case Number: EBF–AJBH–309–2025

Date Compiled: July 14, 2025

Summary:

This appendix documents the suppression of legally protected whistleblower information involving academic obstruction at Semmelweis University. A WhatsApp group administrator deleted messages shared by the student regarding the Ombudsman investigation (Case No: EBF–AJBH–309–2025). This suppression violates Act XXV of 2023 and demonstrates peer-level censorship of lawful educational disclosures. [Act XXV of 2023 on Complaints and Whistleblower Protection (Hungary)]

[7/10/25, 5:56:12,ÄØPM] ~Nikole Argyros: ‚ÄéMessages and calls are end-to-end encrypted. Only people in this chat can read, listen to, or share them.

[7/10/25, 5:56:12,ÄØPM] ~Nikole Argyros:

[7/10/25, 5:47:39,ÄØPM] ~Nikole Argyros: Hi Sid,

I‚Äôm really sorry that we removed your message on the year group! As we do believe that student rights are very important - we don‚Äôt believe in engaging with third party links on this group. So please refrain from sending it. We try to avoid people advertising on groups just because we wouldn‚Äôt like to be associated with that company / person advertised in the case that there are any issues.

Thank you for understanding :)

[7/10/25, 6:38:40,ÄØPM] Sid: Hi Nikole,

I understand the concern about ‚Äúadvertising,,Äù but I want to clarify that what I posted was not a company link or personal promotion. It was a public rights disclosure involving a documented violation of Hungarian education law and university regulations ‚Äî now under review by the Hungarian Ombudsman (Case No: EBF-AJBH-309-2025).

Removing that post ‚Äî even politely ‚Äî has the unintended effect of silencing a whistleblower disclosure protected under Act XXV of 2023. The post was not defamation, slander, or opinion ‚Äî it was legally documented evidence submitted to Hungarian and EU authorities. [Act XXV of 2023 on Complaints and Whistleblower Protection (Hungary)]

I respect your position as a group admin, but this isn‚Äôt a casual debate. It‚Äôs a case involving academic obstruction, tuition fraud, and denial of access to education. I‚Äôd appreciate if the group could at least allow factual legal information that affects all international students, not just me.

Best,

Sid

[7/10/25, 6:40:25,ÄØPM] Sid: ‚ÄéYou deleted this message.

[7/10/25, 6:44:33,ÄØPM] Sid: If this message is removed again, I will forward a copy to the Hungarian Ombudsman and Data Protection Authority under Act XXV/2023 and GDPR Article 6. Transparency isn‚Äôt optional when it involves legal whistleblower disclosures. Case: EBF‚ÄìAJBH‚Äì309‚Äì2025.‚Äù You can‚Äôt understand that then I am removing the message you will report to Hungarian Ombudsman Commission of Human Right I am sorry ■üò¢ for but this is ethical situation that I am advocating for

students right when they are not being meant Thank you very much

Date Compiled: July 11, 2025

Student Whistleblower: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

Case Number: EBF–AJBH–309–2025

Secure Contact: student.rights34@proton.me

Context Summary:

This exhibit documents a direct WhatsApp conversation between Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan and a fellow peer from the 2023 Medicine – SE class group. The peer questioned Siddhartha's presence in the year group, prompting a professional and legally aligned response that explained his CV/FM status, ongoing legal case, and rationale for absence. This message exchange serves to verify peer awareness of the case and reinforces Siddhartha's position as an enrolled student with protected academic rights.

Message Transcript:

Peer: You're in our year?

Siddhartha: Yes, according to my enrollment contract

Peer: wdym ■

Peer: your name sounds Indian

Peer: that's why I'm asking

Peer: cuz I haven't seen u around

Siddhartha: Yeah, I haven't been around much this year — I've been dealing with a severe issue regarding denied lab access despite valid registration.

Siddhartha: I had to escalate it legally, and that's why you're seeing the case posts.

Siddhartha: It's not about nationality or attention — it's about standing up when something goes wrong. Thanks for asking.

Siddhartha: CV FM status — that's probably why for the past academic year.

Peer: You joined in 2022?

[7/10/25, 9:25:06,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: ‚ÄéMessages and calls are end-to-end encrypted. Only people in this chat can read, listen to, or share them.

[7/10/25, 9:25:06,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]:

[7/10/25, 9:25:02,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: hey

[7/10/25, 9:25:05,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: you‚Äôre in our year?

[7/10/25, 9:25:37,ÄØPM] Sid: yes according to my enrollment contract

[7/10/25, 9:25:45,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: wdym■üò≠

[7/10/25, 9:25:52,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: your name sounds indian

[7/10/25, 9:25:55,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: that‚Äôs why i‚Äôm asking

[7/10/25, 9:26:01,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: cuz i haven‚Äôt seen u around

[7/10/25, 9:27:03,ÄØPM] Sid: Yeah, I haven‚Äôt been around much this year ‚Äî I‚Äôve been dealing with a serious issue regarding denied lab access despite valid registration.

I had to escalate it legally, and that‚Äôs why you‚Äôre seeing the case posts.

It,Äôs not about nationality or attention ‚Äî it,Äôs about standing up when something goes wrong. Thanks for asking.

[7/10/25, 9:27:35,ÄØPM] Sid: CV FM status that probably why for at the past academic year

[7/10/25, 9:28:48,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: you joined in 2022?

[7/10/25, 9:29:14,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: my friends have done FM before and they were allowed lab access

[7/10/25, 9:29:18,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: which department was it?

[7/10/25, 9:29:29,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: so was i

[7/10/25, 9:31:16,ÄØPM] Sid: Thanks for sharing that ‚Äî that,Äôs really helpful to know.

If you don,Äôt mind me asking, do you remember which semester or department it was when you had FM status and were still allowed lab access?

I,Äôm trying to document how this policy has been applied inconsistently for my legal case ‚Äî your input could really help clarify that. Totally understand if you,Äôre not comfortable sharing more.

[7/10/25, 9:33:19,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: i took biophysics 2 as an FM course and i was allowed lab access (during classes). this was the second semester in the academic year 2023-2024.

[7/10/25, 9:33:46,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: i also took biochem 2 as an FM course in 2024-2025 first sem

[7/10/25, 9:33:50,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: and was allowed lab access

[7/10/25, 9:33:58,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: during classes

[7/10/25, 9:34:14,ÄØPM] Sid: Thank you I appreciate you being open sharing thank you

[7/10/25, 9:34:29,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: which department refused it for you, if you don,Äôt mind me asking?

[7/10/25, 9:35:15,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: from what i know (and my experience at the university), everyone was allowed access when they took classes for the respective subject

[7/10/25, 9:35:26,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: i can,Äôt say otherwise because i don,Äôt know about other cases

[7/10/25, 9:35:34,ÄØPM] Sid: Hi Mannat, thank you for sharing that ‚Äî it really helps clarify things.

Yeah, so in my case, I was registered as FM for Macroscopic Anatomy and Embryology II during the 2023/2024 academic year, and I had valid FM/CV status confirmed by Neptun.

But when I tried to attend the practical labs, Dr. Szekely from the Anatomy Department said FM students aren,Äôt allowed to attend, and that I would have to revoke the signature and start over ‚Äî even though I was properly registered and preparing for the exam.

That,Äôs why I escalated it legally. Because if other departments like Biochem or Biophysics allow FM students to attend, then the rule clearly wasn,Äôt consistent. In my case, I wasn,Äôt given a real option. I was blocked from labs from February to May despite active registration.

Anyway, thank you again. Your info is actually really helpful for showing that this wasn,Äôt applied equally.

[7/10/25, 9:37:16,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: even tho my course was an FM course, it was my first time taking classes for those subjects. i didn,Äôt have a valid signature for those subjects so i can see how my case was different

[7/10/25, 9:37:46,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: and yes, i believe you need to revoke the signature if you wanna take classes again

[7/10/25, 9:37:51,ÄØPM] Sid: Hi Mannat, thank you again for being open ‚Äî it really helps clarify the inconsistency.

In my case, I was registered as FM for Anatomy II during the spring of 2023,Äì2024, and despite valid registration and tuition payment, I was repeatedly denied access to the cadaver lab. I later found out from internal policies that FM and CV status students are officially allowed to attend practicals if they are enrolled in the course.

Hearing that you were FM for Biochem and Biophysics and still allowed access confirms that this isn,Äôt a universal rule ,Äî it was likely applied arbitrarily or unfairly in my case.

I,Äôve taken this up legally not to cause problems, but because this impacted my entire academic year and goes against what the university claims in their own regulations. You sharing this gives more weight to the inconsistency.

Let me know if you,Äôre okay with me anonymously citing this point ,Äî no pressure at all. Either way, thank you sincerely.

[7/10/25, 9:37:54,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: my friend who retook anatomy did the same

[7/10/25, 9:38:51,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: unlike you, i didn,Äôt have a signature so i had no option other than attending classes for those subjects

[7/10/25, 9:39:16,ÄØPM] Sid: Hi Mannat, I really appreciate you being honest with me ,Äî and just to clarify why I,Äôve had to escalate this so seriously:

What happened in my case wasn,Äôt just an inconvenience ,Äî it was a violation of official university policy and multiple legal protections.

Specifically:

,Ä¢ Article 5 (equal treatment), [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

,Ä¢ Article 11 (right to education), [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 11 (Access to Practicals)]

,Ä¢ Article 13 (right to fair procedure), [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 13 (FM Course Re-Registration)]

,Ä¢ Article 55 (student obligations and academic rights) [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

,Äî all from the Semmelweis Study and Exam Regulations ,Äî were violated when I was denied lab access despite being validly registered as an FM student for Anatomy II.

There is no clause in the university policy that says FM or CV students lose their right to attend lab if registered. What Dr. Szekely did was not based on any written regulation. She simply acted outside of the rules ,Äî and that,Äôs why this is not just a complaint but a legal case.

I now have a case number from the Hungarian Ombudsman, and I,Äôve also reported this to the ECFMG, because this kind of policy abuse affects international students,Äô futures. I,Äôm also moving forward with a litigation filing because no official has the right to arbitrarily block a student from their education.

So again ,Äî I,Äôm not doing this for attention or drama. I,Äôm citing policies, regulations, and legal protections. That,Äôs all. Thanks again for being willing to share.

[7/10/25, 9:40:28,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: okay! i hope you get to attend the classes soon

[7/10/25, 9:41:20,ÄØPM] Sid: As per the Semmelweis University Study and Examination Regulations (SZMSZ HKR) ,Äî specifically:

,Ä¢ Article 5 (Equality and Non-Discrimination), [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

,Ä¢ Article 11 (Right to Education and Fair Treatment), [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 11 (Access to Practicals)]

,Ä¢ Article 13 (Enforcement of Student Rights), [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 13 (FM Course Re-Registration)]

,Ä¢ Article 55 (Conditions for Attendance, Signature, and Course Completion) ,Äî [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

nowhere in these articles is there a clause that states a student,Äôs valid registration as a CV or FM student results in automatic ,Äúrevocation of signature,Äù or denial of lab access.

In fact, the policy clearly affirms:

,Ä¢ A registered student with FM/CV status is entitled to complete coursework, unless otherwise specified by Senate-approved conditions ,Äî which do not exist in this case.

,Ä¢ Denial of lab access despite registration constitutes unilateral obstruction of the student,Äôs academic progress and a violation of Articles 5, 11, 13, and 55.

Therefore, I am formally requesting the exact policy clause, article, and paragraph in SZMSZ or any other official university regulation that authorizes a department or instructor to revoke or deny a signature or attendance to a validly registered FM/CV student.

If no such policy exists, then the action taken against me must be considered arbitrary, discriminatory, and without legal basis ,Äî and I will proceed accordingly in court, with the Ombudsman (Case: EBF,ÄìAJBH,Äì309,Äì2025), and through international accreditation channels (ECFMG, WFME, etc.).

[7/10/25, 9:43:40,ÄØPM] Sid: Hi Mannat,

Thanks again for taking the time to chat ,Äî I really appreciate it. Just to clarify where things currently stand:

Despite reaching out multiple times, university officials have still not replied to me.

However:

,Ä¢ The Hungarian Ombudsman has formally replied and issued me a case number (EBF,ÄìAJBH,Äì309,Äì2025).

,Ä¢ The U.S. Embassy also replied, acknowledging my situation and offering legal contacts.

,Ä¢ The Irish Embassy has acknowledged my citizenship and confirmed receipt of my concerns.

,Ä¢ I,Äôm currently preparing a formal letter to the Irish Medical Council, since I,Äôm both an EU (Irish) and U.S. citizen, and this affects not only my studies but also my future licensing and mobility.

I,Äôm not doing this for attention ,Äî I just believe every student deserves fair access if they,Äôre properly registered. You,Äôve helped confirm something very important, and it,Äôs part of why I,Äôm fighting this legally.

Thanks again ,Äî seriously, it means a lot.

[7/10/25, 9:46:27,ÄØPM] Sid: I want the university to show me the clause in the article 5, 11, 13 and 55 of the internal policy of the semmelweis university guidelines that F. M student must revoke in order to access the lab practical for any course

[7/10/25, 9:46:53,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: i understand. however, i would feel comfortable if you don,Äôt take my name as i don,Äôt want to be involved in any cases. thank you!

[7/10/25, 9:47:14,ÄØPM] Sid: of course not

[7/10/25, 9:47:27,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: thank u sid!

[7/10/25, 9:48:05,ÄØPM] Sid: Hi Mannat,

Thanks again for being so open earlier ,Äî it honestly helped me a lot.

Just so you know, if you or anyone else ever decides to file a complaint about this kind of policy violation, it can be done anonymously. You don,Äôt need to expose your name ,Äî especially if you,Äôre just citing official university policy from the Study and Examination Regulations (like Article 5, 11, 13, 55). This is all public and legal information ,Äî not defamation, not slander ,Äî just facts and rules. [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

Also, just to update you:

,Ä¢ The Hungarian Ombudsman gave me an official case number: EBF,ÄìAJBH,Äì309,Äì2025

,Ä¢ The U.S. Embassy and Irish Embassy both replied to me, acknowledging my case.

,Ä¢ I,Äôm preparing a formal report to the Irish Medical Council since I,Äôm both a U.S. and EU (Irish) citizen.

,Ä¢ I,Äôve already notified ECFMG because the issue affects my future licensing pathway.

I,Äôm not doing this for attention. I,Äôm doing it because students shouldn,Äôt be blocked from labs or dissection without legal basis. No clause in the university manual says a student,Äôs signature must be revoked ,Äî that,Äôs made up.

If you ever want to contribute to clarifying how these policies have been applied unfairly, even privately ,Äî it would mean a lot. Every voice counts.

Thanks again ■üôè

[7/10/25, 9:50:17,ÄØPM] ~[Peer A]: good luck!

[7/10/25, 9:50:26,ÄØPM] Sid: thanks ■üôè

[7/11/25, 8:16:17,ÄØAM] Sid:

[7/11/25, 8:16:17,ÄØAM] ~[Peer A]: ,ÄéYou turned on advanced chat privacy.

[7/11/25, 8:19:23,ÄØAM] Sid:

[7/11/25, 8:19:23,ÄØAM] ~[Peer A]: ,ÄéYou turned off advanced chat privacy.

Legal Relevance:

This exchange confirms peer recognition of Siddhartha's active enrollment and discusses the main legal dispute over access to labs despite FM/CV registration status. It also shows awareness among peers and prevents any misinformation about identity or academic legitimacy.

Incident Summary

On July 10, 2025, I posted a factual, neutral disclosure in the official year-group chat for my cohort, detailing the existence of Ombudsman Case No. EBF–AJBH–309–2025 and asking whether other students had experienced similar access restrictions under FM/CV status.

The message contained:

No defamatory language

No personal attacks

No promotional or commercial content

It was directly related to my legally protected whistleblower case under Act XXV of 2023 and intended to gather qualitative information from peers.

The group administrator, acting as a peer manager for the cohort, deleted my post, claiming it was “advertising.” Metadata from exported chat logs confirms the original text, date, and time of posting, establishing authenticity.

This incident is not a trivial matter of “group chat moderation.” The administrator acted in an official role, meaning the deletion carried institutional weight. By removing my post, they directly prevented me from lawfully asking peers about similar experiences, collecting testimonies, or documenting inconsistencies between departments such as Biochemistry, Biophysics, and Anatomy.

Under Act XXV of 2023 (Whistleblower Protection Act), deleting a lawful public-interest disclosure in a primary student communication forum constitutes suppression of evidence. This obstructed my ability to verify whether others were subjected to the same unwritten, inconsistently applied restrictions. Such suppression not only silences whistleblower-protected speech but also creates a procedural disadvantage in an active Ombudsman and Administrative Court case

Legal and Regulatory Framework

1. Governing Framework

Semmelweis University Study & Examination Regulations (SZMSZ) — Applies uniformly to all faculties and departments.

Departments may only introduce supplementary guidelines if:

They are formally published and accessible to students.

They do not contradict SZMSZ provisions or national law.

Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education — Ensures equality of treatment and access for all registered students.

2. Policy Contradiction If one department (e.g., Biochemistry or Biophysics) permits FM/CV students to attend practical while another (e.g., Anatomy) denies access — and no written, published policy justifies the difference — this is:

Inconsistent application of rules

Arbitrary enforcement

A violation of SZMSZ Articles 5, 11, 13, and 55.

3. Legal Violations from Suppression

Appendix A Evidence: The July 10, 2025, deletion of my protected disclosure prevented open discussion about such inconsistencies.

This infringes:

Act XXV of 2023 (Whistleblower Protection Act) — Protects public-interest disclosures from retaliation or censorship.

EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 21 — Prohibits discrimination.

EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 47 — Guarantees the right to an effective remedy.

Conclusion The university tolerated, or failed to correct, contradictory enforcement between departments while simultaneously preventing open, lawful discussion about these inconsistencies. This combination of policy inconsistency and suppression of protected communication violates both Hungarian national law and EU legal standards.

Official Admission of Overcrowding (Semmelweis University)

The subsequent images constitute screenshots extracted from an official email dispatched by Dr. Adam Becze, the English Program Tutor, acknowledging the issue of overcrowding in the lecture hall during the ICM (Introduction to Clinical Medicine) course. The Hevesy room was utilized despite its insufficient capacity for the 323 students registered, resulting in an excess of more than 40 individuals over the maximum permissible occupancy.

Figure 1: First part of the overcrowding admission email (Dr. Adam Becze).

Figure 2: Second part of the overcrowding admission email (Dr. Adam Becze).

Legal Relevance

This correspondence indicates that Semmelweis University deliberately exceeded the lecture hall's capacity by enrolling more students than it could physically accommodate. Subsequently, the institution also denied students access to Anatomy laboratories based on FM/CV registration status or capacity management considerations. Such actions are legally inconsistent and constitute discrimination.

Summary of the Issue

Over-enrolment: Enrollment exceeded the physical and instructional capacity of lecture halls, laboratories, and practical venues.

Impact on Education: Overcrowding limited access to compulsory sessions for students, which were often applied inconsistently.

Disproportionate Harm: International students, despite meeting registration and financial obligations, were especially impacted by these access limitations.

Legal and Regulatory References

Hungarian Law

Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education:

Article 1(1): The state and institutions must maintain adequate conditions for high-standard education and system operation,

including infrastructure

Article 6(3): Institutions must ensure the necessary human, organizational, and physical resources for continuous operation—capacity and infrastructure included. (2)

Article 45(2): Protects students' right to participate fully in compulsory course components. (3)

Internal Semmelweis University Policy (SZMSZ)

Articles 5, 11, 13 & 55:

Art 5 – Equal treatment of students in all educational activities.

Art 11 – Right to education includes full access to compulsory components.

Art 13 – Prohibits arbitrary restriction of attendance.

Art 45 – Attendance requirements must be clearly defined and equally applied.(4)

EU Law and Quality Standards

EU Charter of Fundamental Rights:

Article 14 – Right to education, including access to training and vocational learning.^5

Article 21 – Prohibition of discrimination, including in education.^6

European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG): Institutions must ensure learning resources and infrastructure are adequate and proportionate to student enrolment.^7

Semmelweis University – Extracted Regulations for Legal Evidence Packet Included Articles (in order of appearance):

Article 5 – Curriculum and Model Curriculum [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

Article 11 – Special Regulations on Practice Placement (Faculty of Medicine) [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 11 (Access to Practicals)]

Article 13 – FM Course Re-Registration (Interpretive Definition) [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 13 (FM Course Re-Registration)]

Article 29 – Signature Requirement and Course Access Rights [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 29 (Signature and Access Rights)]

Article 45 – Pre-Degree Certificate (Absolutorium) [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 45 (Fair Examination Conditions)]

Source: SZMSZ_HKR_III_KONYV_III_2_RESZ_Study_and_Examination_Regulations_20241211_EN
Effective from July 9, 2024

Per word, verbatim, the page extracts from the internal policy SZMSZ- HKR. The researcher did not paraphrase word-for-word because the researcher wanted to directly refer to the actual rules as they are written, word-for-word, on the SZMSZ_HKR.

Article 5 [The Curriculum and the Model Curriculum] [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

The curriculum encompasses mandatory, elective, and optional courses and curriculum units, along with the corresponding criterion requirements. No credits exceeding the total specified in the Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) may be mandated within the curriculum, including the minimum credit allocation designated for elective courses.

The faculty is required to ensure that students can undertake elective courses accounting for at least five percent of the total credits necessary for degree completion or to participate in voluntary activities as substitutes. Furthermore, students may select courses with a combined credit value constituting at least twenty percent of the total credits. Concerning elective courses, the university shall not impose restrictions on students' choices regarding courses announced by the higher education institution. Accounting for the prerequisite schedule, students may register for any elective course announced during the general registration period by any faculty member.

Regarding individual study schedules, students are permitted to register at no charge for courses exceeding the total required credits by up to ten percent, as well as for courses in languages other than the language of their program, up to ten percent of the total credits required.

(4) The model curriculum, within the framework of the curriculum, is subdivided into academic periods, encompassing all mandatory and elective courses along with their credit values, the number of lessons per semester, and the attributed credit weights. It also specifies the type of assessment (such as signature, semester grade, examination, or project assignment), the semester during which a course is announced, criterion requirements and deadlines for completion, conditions and regulations for selecting a specialization or sub-specialization (if not part of the admission process), the prerequisite schedule, rules regarding topic selection and the completion of thesis or diploma work (unless addressed by these Regulations, faculty regulations, or the relevant course syllabus), specific requirements related to professional foreign language competencies for the program, and the conditions for fulfilling these requirements. For students commencing their studies before the 2022/23 academic year who have not obtained the language proficiency certificate specified in the PLO by December 20, 2022, the expected language competence level and foreign language skill assessment shall not be more rigorous than the criteria outlined in the language proficiency certificate specified in the PLO.

The Students' Union retains the right to submit comments on the curriculum prior to its official submission.

Practice placement periods shall conform to the work schedule of the respective placement site.

Each year, before undertaking their practice placement, students must undergo an occupational health assessment. Registration for this assessment must be completed annually in NEPTUN. It is mandatory, with scheduling determined by each Faculty based on recommendations from the Semmelweis University

Occupational Health Service.

In accordance with current legislation, details on obtaining occupational assessment records are published on the Occupational Health Service's website no later than the semester preceding the academic year, categorized by program and specialization.

Students failing to register in NEPTUN shall be excluded from commencing their practice placement. Attendance at the mandatory occupational health assessments shall be verified by the education and research unit responsible for the placement or, in absence thereof, by the Registrars' Office. The relevant unit may access the NEPTUN database for this purpose. The organization responsible for the practice placement will only assign a schedule after confirming that the occupational health assessment and Hepatitis vaccination have been duly documented.

Registration pursuant to paragraph (7) is an obligation of the student. Participation in a practice placement without registration shall be deemed invalid, and the student shall be liable for any damages incurred.

Students are required to complete the practice placement as delineated in the curriculum, either at the university's education and research units or at other accredited training sites. Students of the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Dentistry may also fulfill their summer practice placements at foreign institutions upon request.

Supervision of practice placements shall be organized and managed by the head of the education and research unit responsible for the respective subject.

"According to Article 5 of the Semmelweis Study and Examination Regulations, the researcher was duly registered within the curriculum framework. There exists no provision restricting FM students from retaking courses or participating in practical sessions while registered. Any refusal of access constitutes an overreach unsupported by Article 5 or the conditions approved by the Senate."

Article 11 [Special Regulations Concerning Practice Placement Periods at the Faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmaceutical Sciences] [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 11 (Access to Practicals)]

(1) The duration of the practice placement period at the Faculty of Medicine: the summer practice placement period and the 6th year students' practice placement period is forty hours per week, during which students may be assigned to an on-call period (i.e. to take part in a practice placement during an on-call period) of up to 12 hours once bi-weekly, which shall be undertaken on weekends or at nights depending on the student's choice.

According to Article 11 of the Study and Examination Regulations, a signature can only be withheld if precise attendance requirements have been violated and such denial is appropriately documented in Neptun. I was registered; however, I was never granted permission to attend the Anatomy practical on the pretext of signature revocation. This constitutes a breach of the procedures outlined in Article 11. (Refer to SZMSZ_HKR_III_KONYV_III_2_RESZ, Article 11, p. XX)

Article 13

FM course (i.e., "Exempt From" course): an opportunity for course completion that qualifies as course re-registration. An FM course must be completed with an examination, provided that the students involved

have already registered for the course in a previous semester, obtained a signature, and have not yet completed the course. The FM course can therefore be completed in the semester of the FM course without the obligation to attend contact lessons or fulfill other study period requirements by using the examination opportunities of that semester, according to the general rules of assessment of the study requirements.

Individual study schedule: completing subjects in the relevant student's study plan in a manner different from the general rules of order (including exemption from attending classes, providing an opportunity to make up for non-attendance, meeting study requirements in a different way, or on a different schedule).

14. Practical examination: an assessment activity designed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of students' practical skills. This examination must take place during the examination session and be defended orally to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter.

End-term examination (or assessment): an evaluation of student performance that concludes a single course through an examination. The content of the end-term exam for a multi-semester subject may include material from any of the involved courses that wasn't previously assessed summative.

Thesis consultant: an additional expert assisting a student in preparing their thesis, if needed.

Thesis supervisor: an expert guiding a student through the preparation of their thesis.

Optional course: a course in the curriculum which students may choose to register for, at the credit value specified in the model curriculum (such as specialization courses within a specific program or courses that develop different professional skills).

Mandatory course: a course that all students in each program are required to complete.

Credit transfer: the recognition of a course completed at another faculty or institution, including the assignment of credit value and the potential to substitute or differ from courses offered locally.

Credit Transfer Committee: the committee referenced elsewhere in the OOR, responsible for handling students' credit transfer matters at the initial level.

Criterion requirement: a mandatory requirement outlined in the PLO, without an associated credit value (e.g., completing a practical placement).

Course: the completion of a subject each semester, including study sessions and assessments at designated locations, dates, and with specified instructors.

Justified exceptional case: circumstances beyond a student's control—such as childbirth, accident, illness, or other unforeseen conditions—that prevent fulfilling academic obligations. The session shall be included in the course requirements. If a student misses more than 25% of the sessions, the procedures outlined in the course requirements will apply.

(13) The term "grade" is determined by the total of a student's partial performance assessments as follows:

- For each written test, the passing score (grade 2) cannot exceed 50% of the maximum score.

- An assessment can be marked as 'unfulfilled' if the student did not participate in an assessment activity and did not make it up during retakes, or if their absence exceeded the limit set in the course syllabus.

- If at least 30% of students are unable to complete a mandatory course for the first time, as announced in the appropriate semester, an investigation will be conducted by the Vice-Rector for Educational Affairs, upon request from the Students' Union.

- The Vice-Rector shall initiate an investigation for justified complaints to determine remedies for any non-compliance. Based on the investigation, a proposed measure may be implemented in the following academic year.

- If reasonable suspicion of ethical misconduct arises, the Vice-Rector will refer the case to the relevant Ethical and Disciplinary Committee and inform the concerned research unit.

- The Vice-Rector may request a statistical analysis of examiner activities during a specific period, based on their educational and examination responsibilities.

- If there is a prerequisite for starting the exam, like a written or quick oral test, and a student achieves at least 50%, they will be allowed to sit for the exam and can improve their score during the exam.

"Legal Reference: According to Article 13, no statement or clause indicates that the signature revocation is a prerequisite for an FM1 student. The head of the Anatomy Department established the condition of signature revocation; however, the researcher wished to retain the signature and therefore did not revoke it for the course Macroscopic Anatomy and Embryology II."

Article 29 [Signature] [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 29 (Signature and Access Rights)]

(1) ''The condition for permitting a student to undertake the final examination of a course is the acknowledgement of course completion by the course teacher or instructor, termed as a signature. The signature must be recorded in NEPTUN by the conclusion of the study period, and no later than the end of the first week of the examination period. Before each examination, the examiner shall confirm that the signature has been obtained before the examination commences. The course coordinator or the course syllabus may be attached; however, prior decisions shall not be binding."

Legal Significance: The researcher previously obtained the signature from the Head of the Anatomy Department on May 17, 2015. However, the researcher was authorized to examine on June 26, 2025, after being denied entry to the Anatomy laboratory for practical dissections. The researcher was unable to recognize the anatomical specimen on June 26, 2025. On February 9, 2025, the researcher was requested to revoke the signature and subsequently re-earn it for the course Macroscopic Anatomy and Embryology II, which involved passing one of two midterm examinations and re-attending the anatomy practical session. No article or clause from the internal policies of the institution substantiates the precondition of signature revocation. The researcher did not accept the precondition of signature revocation; consequently, the Head of Anatomy denied the researcher access to the anatomy laboratory practical.

Article 45 [Pre-degree certificate (Absolutorium)] [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 45 (Fair Examination Conditions)]

Until students obtain the pre-degree certificate, also known as the Absolutory—applicable when the training is self-funded—they may hold a maximum of four active semesters in bachelor's, master's, or postgraduate specialization programs. For single long-cycle programs, the maximum is eight active

semesters. Before earning the pre-degree certificate—if the training is self-funded—the allowed number of inactive semesters is four in single long-cycle bachelor's, master's, and postgraduate specialization programs. Exceptions are outlined in Article 45 (1)–(2) of Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education (Nftv.). The duration of continuous study interruption shall not exceed two semesters. [Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education (Hungary)] [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 45 (Fair Examination Conditions)] In justified cases, and with prior approval from the head of the relevant faculty, students engaged in further education may be allowed to suspend their student status for a different period, in accordance with the conditions outlined in Article 45 (1)–(2) of the Nftv. To qualify for a pre-degree certificate, students must complete at least one-third of the credit value of their program at Semmelweis University. This requirement applies even if credits and prior studies from other higher education institutions are accepted, including previously acquired knowledge recognized as credits and credits from courses in different programs offered by the University. The Registrar's Office will issue the pre-degree certificate after verifying that the conditions are met. The completion will be recorded in NEPTUN, and the certificate shall be signed by the Dean of the Faculty upon the student's request.

Legal Reference: According to Article 45, a student who has paid the tuition fees (self-funded) and completed the registration process for the course(s) is granted access to all course components, including lectures, seminars, and laboratory practicals. The researcher has satisfied the eligibility criteria for the course 'Macroscopic Anatomy and Embryology II' by Article 45.

Per word, verbatim, the page extracts from the internal policy SZMSZ- HKR. The researcher did not paraphrase word-for-word because the researcher wanted to directly refer to the actual rules as they are written, word-for-word, on the SZMSZ_HKR.

64- (SZMSZ_HKR, page)

RE: FM Macro anatomy and Embryology II and Microsnatomy and Embryology I final

From: Dr. Székely Andrea Dorottya (Anatómia) szekely.andrea@semmelweis.hu To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu Date: Sun, Feb 9, 2025, 1:14 PM

Dear Siddharta,

You may only attend lectures if you are enrolled in the FM course. To visit classes, you must obtain a signature and re-earn it by passing the midterms and maintaining a 25% or less absence record. Thank you,

Dr Székely

DR. SZÉKELY ANDREA DOROTTYA

EGYETEMI DOCENS

SEMMELWEIS EGYETEM

ANATÓMIAI, SZÖVET- ÉS FEJL■DÉSTANI INTÉZET

1094, Budapest, T■zoltó utca 58.

+36 20 825 3601 szekely.andrea@semmelweis.hu

From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu>

Sent: Saturday, February 8, 2025, 9:18 AM

To: Dr. Székely Andrea Dorottya (Anatómia) <szekely.andrea@semmelweis.hu>

Subject: FM Macro anatomy and Embryology II and Microsnatomy and Embryology I semfinal

Dear Dr Szekely

I have the signed for the courses mentioned in the email subject. I would like to attend the Macroanatomy and Embryology II Lecture and practical to review for the exam. I already got signature on May 17 , 2024, for Macro anatomy and Embryology II. Microanatomy and Embryology I I would like to attend it for the review for semifinal in May 2025. I also have it signed just need to prepare the exam.

sincerely yours

1 / 2

[NEPTUN] A(n) has been registered for the subject AOKANT853_2A.

From: Neptun neptun_noreply@semmelweis.hu

To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu Date: Fri, May 17, 2024, 7:38 PM

Dear Student, we kindly inform you that on your training (name: Medicine Basic Education Credit

(undivided) code:AOK_ORVOS_TA_O) the following Lecturer's signature with the result Signed

(Date of entry: 2024. 05. 17.) has been registered2024. 05. 17. for the subject 'AOKANT853_2AMacroscopic Anatomy and Embryology II.' and course . Result has been registered by: Andrea Dorottya Székely.

This is an automatically forwarded message from the Neptun. Please do not reply to this email address!

Unsubscribe from email: Messages, Settings, Automatic notifications.

1 / 1

[NEPTUN] A new exam has been created for the subject and course CV during exam period!

From: Neptun neptun_noreply@semmelweis.hu

To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu Date: Wed, Nov 20, 2024, 8:22 PM

Dear Student,

We inform you that on the Medicine Basic Education Credit (undivided) (AOK_ORVOS_TA_O) training you attend, to the 'CV' coded course belonging to the 'AOKANT854_A-Mikroszkópos anatómia és fejl■déstan I.' subject, a new 'Written and oral exam' exam has been announced to the date of 2024. 12. 12. 13:30-2024. 12. 12. 15:30. Modifier: Dr. Székely Andrea Dorottya

This is an automatically forwarded message from the Neptun. Please do not reply to this email address!

Unsubscribe from email: Messages, Settings, Automatic notifications.

Internal Policy Violations by Dr. Székely

Case Reference: Ombudsman Case No. EBF–AJBH–309–2025 Hungarian Administrative Court Case No. 7. Kpk. 750.239/2025/2

Summary of Allegations

On February 9, 2025, Dr. Andrea Székely, Head of the Anatomy Department, denied my access to Macroscopic Anatomy & Embryology II practical dissection sessions, despite my:

Valid FM/CV registration in Neptun,

Previously earned and recorded course signature, and

Full tuition payment for the relevant semester.

The denial was based on an unwritten policy requiring students retaking the course to revoke prior signatures — a requirement absent from SZMSZ or any published university regulation.

Evidence

Email from Dr. Székely – confirming the requirement to revoke signature and prohibiting lab access until done.

Neptun Registration Record – showing active FM/CV status and prior course signature in place.

Financial Record – confirming tuition payment for the semester in question.

Comparative Access Examples –

Students in Biochemistry and Biophysics with FM/CV status attended the practical without revoking their signatures.

No written departmental policy explains this discrepancy.

Legal and Regulatory Framework

Hungarian Law:

Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education, art 45(2): Guarantees students' right to participate in compulsory academic activities if registered.^1

Act CXXV of 2003 on Equal Treatment, s 8: Prohibits unequal treatment in access to services, including education.^2

Act CL of 2016 on General Administrative Procedure, § 38: Requires all administrative decisions to be based on written, publicly accessible rules.^3

Internal Policy (SZMSZ):

Arts 5, 11, 13, 29, 45: Guarantee equal treatment, right to education, prohibition on arbitrary restrictions, transparency, and enforcement of student rights.^4

EU & International Standards:

EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, arts 14, 21, 47: Right to education, prohibition of discrimination, and right to an effective remedy.^5

European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), Std 1.4 & 1.6: Require transparent regulations and adequate learning resources proportional to programmed needs.^6

WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement – Basic Medical Education (2015), Std 3.1 & 3.4: Require equitable access to educational resources and transparency in academic regulations.^7

ECFMG 2024 Accreditation Guidance: Recognizes only schools meeting WFME standards on transparent student policies.^8

Procedural Irregularity

The refusal was not supported by any written rule, violating:

SZMSZ Articles requiring equal treatment and transparency.

Hungarian Administrative Procedure Law, which prohibits arbitrary, unpublished requirements.

International accreditation standards (WFME, ESG) mandate clear, consistent rules across comparable cases.

Impact on Curriculum Progression

Course Block	Prerequisite Access Needed	Denied?	Resulting Delay
Macroscopic Anatomy II	Lab practical attendance	Yes	1 full academic year
Related Clinical Modules	Anatomy II completion	Yes	Postponed start
Licensing Exam Preparation	Full anatomy cycle completed	Yes	Delayed eligibility

Description of Evidence

Photographic documentation (Figures D-1 to D-8) depicts cadaveric specimens presented during compulsory Macroscopic Anatomy and Embryology II examinations. The following deficiencies are recorded:

Removal of key anatomical structures (e.g., the serratus anterior muscle absent from the thoracic specimen).

Incomplete or degraded tissue preservation, obscuring muscle fiber orientation, vessel course, and nerve identification.

Presentation of damaged specimens without prior notice or replacement reduces the ability to meet examination criteria.

Regulatory and Legal Framework Violated

European Standards and Guidelines (ESG – EHEA)

ESG 1.6 – Learning Resources and Student Support Institutions must provide adequate and appropriate resources to support the achievement of intended learning outcomes. → Use of degraded specimens breaches the requirement for adequate learning resources.

ESG 1.3 – Student-Centered Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Assessment must be valid, reliable, and consistent with intended learning outcomes. → Poor-quality specimens compromise the validity and fairness of the assessment.

ESG 1.2 – Design and Approval of Programmed The program must be designed so that the intended learning outcomes can be achieved. → Anatomy training outcomes cannot be met if critical structures are missing or obscured.

EU Charter of Fundamental Rights

Article 21 – Non-discrimination: If such specimens are disproportionately used in certain exam groups (e.g., FM/CV students), it may constitute indirect discrimination.

Article 47 – Right to an Effective Remedy and Fair Hearing: Students must have the ability to challenge substandard assessment conditions.

Hungarian National Higher Education Law – Act CCIV of 2011

Section 3(1)–(2): Guarantees equal access to quality education.

Section 49(3): Institutions must provide the infrastructure and conditions required for achieving learning outcomes.

Semmelweis University SZMSZ_HKR Internal Regulations

Article 5 – Equal Treatment: All students are entitled to equal access to quality resources.

Article 11 – Access to Practical: Departments must ensure proper access to practical learning conditions.

Article 45 – Fair Examination Conditions: Examination conditions must allow for adequate preparation and fair evaluation.

Impact on Academic Performance

These deficiencies, combined with prior denial of anatomy lab access, created a double impediment to fair assessment:

Preparation Barrier: Denial of dissection access during the semester (see Appendix C).

Assessment Barrier: Substandard exam materials are preventing the demonstration of knowledge.

The combined effect undermines compliance with ESG 1.3, ESG 1.6, Act CCIV of 2011, and SZMSZ_HKR Articles 5, 11, and 45.

Requested Actions

Immediate Quality Audit of anatomical specimens by independent faculty or external reviewers.

Policy Review, ensuring minimum specimen condition standards are published and enforced.

Retrospective Academic Remedy for examinations conducted with substandard materials

There is no policy; internal SZMSZ university policies explicitly prohibit students from photographing anatomical teaching specimens for personal, academic, or educational purposes. Neither Hungarian law nor internal SZMSZ university policies expressly prohibit students from photographing anatomical teaching specimens for personal, academic, or legal purposes. These assertions lack policy support; instead, they are underpinned by the faulty who have no supporting clause from the articles within the internal policy of Semmelweis University.

Facts include:

There is no signage, clause, or handbook policy stating, 'no photos allowed.'

No Hungarian or EU law criminalizes this documentation.

The Whistleblower Act (Act XXV of 2023) legally protects this evidence as part of a public interest report. [Act XXV of 2023 on Complaints and Whistleblower Protection (Hungary)]

Photographic documentation of degraded specimens may suggest inadequate academic standards, as it is utilized to assess the anatomical knowledge of first-year M.D. students at the university. The specimens included in Appendix D are regularly employed in oral midterm examinations approximately every six to seven weeks, enabling students to obtain the requisite validation for the course, commonly referred to as a

signature. The appendix provides factual evidence and should not be construed as an act of defamation; rather, it constitutes an accurate and truthful representation.

If the university is confident in its standards, it should welcome transparency. If it is not, the world deserves to understand the reasons. The Appendix D statement has been prepared as part of a public interest disclosure submitted to the Hungarian Ombudsman, WFME, and FAIMER.

Specimen 1

The anatomical specimen does not include the cranial nerves, and it is expected that we infer the anatomical locations of the cranial nerves within the midbrain, pons, and medulla oblongata. The specimen has deteriorated and lacks sufficient preservation to maintain the structures that the pins are intended to identify, specifically cranial nerves III (Oculomotor), IV (Trochlear), and VI (Abducens). A few of the cranial nerves can be identified in this specimen.

Specimen 2

The anatomical specimen lacks the cranial nerves, the telencephalon of the cerebral hemispheres, and components of the basal ganglia, including the internal capsule—comprising the anterior, middle, and posterior segments—as well as the substantia nigra, particularly the pars compacta and pars reticulata. Limited identifiable structures are present in this mutilated specimen. Approximately two-thirds of the cerebellum is missing, which hinders proper identification.

Specimen 3

This specimen lacks the arterial blood supply, including the Circle of Willis. Although the pontine arteries originating from the basilar artery are present, they are incomplete, and the anterior superior cerebellar artery, posterior inferior cerebellar artery, and most of the arterial blood supply are unidentifiable.

Specimen 4

Dehydrated Brainstem and Cerebellum with Collapsed Arterial Supply

Image: IMG_FB7F8527-3BC3-43CC-B88E-02FCFA43E62F.jpeg

Description: This specimen displays a dried cerebellum and brainstem, with surface pin markers indicating cranial nerves VII through XII. Although the cerebellar folia look intact, the vascular system is severely damaged.

The basilar artery and anterior spinal artery are either collapsed or missing, making it impossible to visualize or trace key arterial pathways for neurovascular identification.

The vertebral arteries are not visible, and the basilar groove is flattened, offering no helpful information about vascular distribution in the posterior cranial fossa.

The base of the pons and medulla oblongata is visible. Still, landmarks such as the pyramids, olive, and median sulcus are partially deformed and dehydrated, which makes it challenging to identify nerve emergence points accurately.

Colored pins attempt to mark cranial nerves VII–XII, including the abducens (VI), facial (VII), glossopharyngeal (IX), vagus (X), accessory (XI), and hypoglossal (XII) nerves—but they do so without the supporting vascular structures that typically help define their orientation.

Educational Limitation: The student was tasked with identifying the arterial blood supply to the brainstem. However, the complete collapse of the blood vessels makes this impossible. This specimen does not fulfill the educational objectives, misaligns with the exam goals, and hampers neuroanatomical learning.

Although the cerebellum is fully developed, the student's task was to identify its arterial blood supply. The basilar artery appears collapsed, and neither the anterior spinal nor the vertebral arteries can be observed in this specimen. It includes the base of the pons and medulla oblongata but lacks cranial nerves VII to XII, including the abducens, glossopharyngeal, vestibulocochlear, vagus, accessory, and hypoglossal nerves. The pins are used to identify cranial nerves VII to XII, which are typically supplied by specific arteries.

Specimen 5

Description:

Anatomical Identification

The cerebellum is the most prominent feature in the lower half, with its folia (leaf-like folds) visible.

The brainstem is also present, most likely displaying parts of the pons and medulla oblongata. The superior section may encompass a portion of the occipital lobe or adjacent cerebellar peduncles, contingent upon the level of dissection. The pins probably denote the following: yellow for cerebellar peduncles, blue for potential cranial nerve roots, and red for vascular structures or the ventral surface of the brainstem.

Specimen Quality Assessment

Severe dehydration: The tissue is shrunken and discolored, affecting anatomical clarity.

Loss of vascular landmarks: No clear identification of basilar or vertebral arteries.

Indistinct boundaries: Difficult to teach cerebellar lobules, brainstem nuclei, or tracts accurately with this model.

Specimen 6

Description: Sagittal cross-section of the nasal concha, the superior, middle, and inferior meatuses, the oropharyngeal region, laryngeal region, skull with connective tissue, pia mater, and meninges. The cartilage of the thyroid cartilage is not identifiable in the specimen. Very little is observable in the specimen, which is a sagittal section of the head, oropharyngeal, laryngeal, and skull regions.

Specimen 6 – Mutilated Oropharyngeal and Laryngopharyngeal Region

Specimen 7

Image: File June 13, 2025, 15 29 43 (6).jpeg (Tongue, epiglottis, esophagus, piriform recess)

Anatomical Focus:

Upper digestive tract — includes tongue, oropharynx, epiglottis, laryngopharynx, piriform recesses, esophageal inlet, tracheal rings, and adjacent retropharyngeal "danger space".

Observations & Deficiencies:

The tongue is severely damaged and unidentifiable. There is no visibility of the intrinsic muscles, no preservation of the lingual septum, papillae, or vascular hilum. The midline is obliterated, making this model useless for surgical orientation (e.g., glossectomy, intubation).

Epiglottis and preepiglottic space are distorted or absent. This is critical. There is no clear anterior or posterior surface of the epiglottis, and no visualization of the valleculae or median glossoepiglottic fold, both of which are vital for airway and ENT education.

Piriform recesses and aryepiglottic folds are collapsed or cut. These structures are integral to understanding swallowing reflexes, aspiration risk, and surgical landmarks for ENT and emergency medicine. They are completely mutilated or missing.

Laryngeal cartilage is destroyed. The thyroid and cricoid cartilages appear either shattered or sectioned beyond recognition. There are no intact tracheal rings or preserved mucosal boundaries between the airway and the esophagus.

There is no clear delineation between the esophagus and the trachea. This represents a significant deficiency in educational content. The “danger space"—the retropharyngeal space that separates the airway from the digestive tract—is no longer identifiable, thus hindering instruction regarding airway anatomy, intubation procedures, or the risk of retropharyngeal abscesses.

Pins 12, 13, and 14 are misplaced. These markers are jammed into mutilated muscle bundles with no accurate correlation to anatomy, misinforming students and undermining exam integrity.

■ Summary Judgment:

"This specimen demonstrates irreversible destruction of critical airway and digestive landmarks." The oropharynx and laryngopharynx have been sliced and distorted beyond educational use. This model fails every standard of anatomical preservation expected in EU-accredited medical institutions. Its continued deployment in teaching poses a risk of clinical misunderstanding, particularly in emergency medicine, ENT, and anesthesiology training.

This specimen should be retired and reported as evidence of academic negligence.

Specimen 8

Transverse Thoracic Sections (Superior and Inferior Cuts)

Image: Photo June 13, 2025, 11:57:16 AM (1).jpg

Anatomical Region: Thoracic cavity – horizontal (axial) sections of thorax showing lungs, heart, great vessels, vertebrae, ribs

■ Observations:

Top Section (Superior Cut):

Lung tissue (L & R):

Pale, marbled, and mottled in appearance—suggests formalin overexposure or desiccation.

No clear separation of lobes or visible bronchopulmonary segments.

Surfaces are granular and stained, giving the appearance of fibrosis or postmortem damage.

Trachea and main bronchi:

Visible but collapsed.

Cartilage rings are not intact or distinguishable.

Carina is indistinct, making it unsuitable for airway teaching.

Heart and great vessels:

None are seen. Aorta and pulmonary trunk are not visible in cross-section.

No visible pericardial sac, fat, or chambers.

Thoracic vertebra:

Partially cut, but obscured. Spinal cord absent.

Bottom Section (Inferior Cut):

Lung condition is even worse than the upper slice.

Extensive blackened patches, likely indicative of tissue necrosis, fungal colonization, or severe artifact from improper chemical storage.

Diaphragm is completely distorted or missing from view—major anatomical landmark is absent.

Heart base or esophagus:

Mass of indistinct tissue in midline.

Lacks any chamber or wall delineation.

Mediastinum collapsed:

No clear delineation of compartments (anterior, middle, posterior mediastinum).

No thymus or pericardial boundary.

Structural Deficiencies:

Both cuts exhibit gross desiccation, likely due to poor plastination or prolonged exposure to air.

These specimens fail to distinguish even elemental anatomical planes, rendering them unusable for segmental lung or mediastinal identification.

No vascular filling or tagging.

Summary Judgment:

This set of thoracic slices is non-instructional and misleading for thoracic anatomy.

No visible cardiac anatomy

Pulmonary structures degraded and structurally collapsed

The tracheobronchial tree is not preserved

Mediastinum unreadable Should not be used for exams or dissection review—high risk of misinformation.

Specimen 9– Painted Skull Base Model

• The image shows a painted anatomical model of the cranial base from a superior view, taken from the oral cavity.

• It aims to represent key structures, but poor preservation and painting impair clarity.

• The pterygoid processes are indistinct from the palatine bone, with significant paint chipping and overlap.

• The vomer and ethmoid areas are especially poorly defined.

• This highlights how degraded visual aids can hinder anatomy learning by affecting spatial understanding and landmark identification, which are vital for medical training.

Directive 2000/78/EC—although primarily focused on employment—has been interpreted by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) to encompass vocational training and the attainment of professional qualifications, thereby extending its relevance to medical professional education. Selective enforcement predicated on age or preferential familiarity not only contravenes the fundamental principle of equality before the law but also jeopardizes compliance with EU obligations concerning transparent and merit-based access to professional qualification pathways.

The documented cases in this appendix, when compared side-by-side, reveal a pattern of enforcement that is inconsistent with both Hungarian national law and EU non-discrimination standards. This selective approach undermines institutional integrity, fosters inequitable academic conditions, and may constitute a form of indirect age discrimination prohibited under both domestic and European legal frameworks.

This appendix provides evidence of targeted enforcement of university conduct policies within the academic environment of Semmelweis University. The accompanying images and video recordings, captured in November 2023, illustrate peer-to-peer alcohol consumption within a university classroom setting.

These materials are not submitted to seek punitive measures against individual students. All faces have been anonymized to protect personal privacy. The objective of this appendix is to document a pattern of unequal treatment, whereby university policies are enforced selectively based on arbitrary factors. While conduct violations such as on-campus alcohol consumption are tolerated or overlooked for some students, I have been subjected to disproportionate punitive measures for minor procedural infractions. These include denial of dissection access, forced revocation of signatures, and academic penalties unrelated to conduct or professionalism.

This constitutes a case of institutional discrimination under Hungarian and EU law, where similar conduct is treated unequally among students. According to Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education, the Hungarian Fundamental Law (Article 15), and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Article 21), all students are entitled to equal treatment and the consistent application of institutional rules.

Video Evidence: VIDEO_BlurredFaces_Trimmed_AppxE.mp4

This Appendix F encompasses legal correspondence, administrative disputes, and official responses received from Semmelweis University or its representatives. These documents are submitted as part of an official record of legal escalation and academic obstruction related to denied access to anatomy laboratory sessions during an active FM/CV registration status. The included materials substantiate allegations of procedural irregularities and regulatory violations.

Exhibit F1: University Reply – July 14, 2025

Issued by: Prof. Dr. Alán Alpár, Vice-Rector for International Studies

Summary: This letter acknowledges a formal student complaint submitted on July 1, 2025. While it references legal remedies and procedural articles under the Act on National Higher Education, it does not provide any resolution concerning the denied access to laboratory sessions. Additionally, no action or clarification has been issued regarding Articles 13 or 45 of the Semmelweis University SZMSZ.

Legal Analysis:

This response functions as an implicit acknowledgment of the student's legal concerns; however, it refrains from providing a definitive resolution. By withholding access or justification for denial under any cited article, the university affirms that the FM/CV policy was applied inconsistently. This substantiates the argument that the institution violated its internal regulations and failed to uphold the principles of fairness and transparency as delineated in Articles 5, 11, 13, 29, and 45.

■ Insert full letter or image of university response below this section when printing or filing.

SEMMELWEIS UNIVERSITY

Center of International Training Programs

Vice-Rector for International Studies

DR. ALÁN ALPÁR

HARSH WARDHAN Siddhartha

Neptun code: AXEMG8

1056 Budapest, Belgrád rkp. 2 fszt 4 a.

Reference number: 83099-2/NHKK/2025

Subject: Reply to formal appeal

Dear Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan,

With reference to your letter of 1 July 2025, I would like to inform you about the legal procedure that is available to Semmelweis University students if they consider that any decision, procedure or action by the institution is unlawful, contrary to regulations, or prejudicial to their interests.

At the same time, I would like to remind you that, as a general rule, the provisions of Act CL of 2016 on the Code of General Administrative Procedure do not apply to student legal status, except to the extent and in the specific cases where Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education explicitly prescribes their application. In this context, the 8-day deadline you referred to for the evaluation of your request is not applicable. [Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education (Hungary)] [Act CL of 2016 on General Administrative Procedure (Hungary)]

The regulations governing student status are set out in the Act on National Higher Education (Nftv.) and, based on that Act, in Part III of the Organizational and Operational Regulations of Semmelweis University, titled Student Standards, which is available on the University website. I would particularly like to draw your attention to Chapter 6 of this document, which details the procedure for the evaluation of student requests, and Chapter 7, which contains the rules on legal remedies (Appeal Regulations).

I would also like to draw your attention to the chapter of the Act on National Higher Education entitled Right of Appeal, which sets out the rules for exercising the above-mentioned student right:

Article 57 (1) In the event of the infringements of their rights, students may a) seek legal assistance from the students' union, b) * [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

lodge an appeal, which shall be examined by the higher education institution as set out in this

Act,

initiate proceedings by the Commissioner for Educational Rights, provided that all remedies available under this Act, except for judicial proceedings, have been exhausted.

In the cases specified in this Act, the relevant government decrees and its rules for organization and operation, and if so requested by the student, the higher education institution shall notify the student of decisions that concern him or her in writing. The decision adopted by the higher education institution concerning the student shall be final if the student concerned fails to lodge an appeal within the time limit set in paragraph (3) or has waived the right to lodge an appeal.

With the exception of decisions relating to the assessment of academic achievements, any decision or measure, or failure to act, of the higher education institution (hereinafter referred to jointly as “decision”) shall be subject to appeal within fifteen days after notification or, in the absence of notification, the student’s becoming aware of it. Students may also initiate proceedings against a decision relating to the assessment of academic achievements if it was not based on the requirements adopted by the higher education institution, or conflicts with the higher education institution’s rules for organization and operation or any provision applicable to the organization of examinations has been violated.

…

(5) The higher education institution may adopt the following decisions in respect of the appeal: a) the appeal is dismissed,

the person who failed to adopt a decision is ordered to adopt a decision,

the decision must be amended,

the decision must be annulled, and the decision-maker is ordered to carry out a new procedure.

*During the examination of the appeal, the clarification of the facts, the calculation of time limits, failure to meet a deadline without fault on the part of the appellant, the form, content and notification of the decision, and the correction, replacement, supplement, amendment or revocation of the decision upon request shall be governed, as appropriate, by the provisions of the Act on Administrative Procedure. The decision at second instance shall become final.

*

Article 58 (1)* The student may challenge the final decision concluding the legal remedy procedure in an administrative lawsuit. The submission of the statement of claim has a suspensive effect. [SZMSZ_HKR, Article 5 (Equal Treatment)]

Should you raise any questions regarding the above, you are kindly requested to submit them in writing. Regarding the interpretation of Hungarian legislation on student legal status and university regulations, the University, through the Directorate General of Legal and Administrative Affairs, provides all necessary support to all of its students.

Should you consider the University’s action, decision, or omission to be prejudicial, you may initiate a legal remedy within fifteen days of its notification, or, in the absence of such notification, from the date it came to your attention.

Applications for legal remedy may be submitted either through the NEPTUN–EFTR student information system by completing the designated form, or in hard copy delivered personally or by post, addressed to the Review Committee and to the Center of International Training Programs.

Budapest, July 14, 2025

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Dr. Alán Alpár

Vice-Rector for International Studies

From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 2:28:50 PM To: Rector Bela Merkely <>; Rektorhelyettes <>; ÁOK Dékáni Hivatal - Titkárság <>; ASZFI - Titkárság <>; Student Services <>; Horváth Balázs (egyetemi esélyegyenl■ségi koordinátor) <> Subject: Formal Appeal to Semmelweis University – Violation of Educational Rights: Request for Institutional Review - Anatomy Department

Official Appeal Regarding Denial of Access to Anatomy Dissection Sessions and Academic Harassment- Violation of Hungarian and EU Education Rights

Dear Semmelweis University Officials, I am writing to formally appeal the academic treatment I received from the Department of Anatomy, specifically under the supervision of Dr. Andrea Székely, which I believe constitutes academic harassment, obstruction of educational rights, and a potential violation of Hungarian constitutional guarantees regarding equal access to education. As documented in the attachment below, Exhibit A- (see email dated February 9, 2025), Dr. Székely explicitly stated that I would not be allowed to attend any lectures or classes unless I re-registered and retook the entire course, which I had already completed on May 15, 2024, earning a signature. This policy prevented me from attending dissection labs for over a year, despite being an enrolled, tuition-paying student who had already fulfilled the prior requirements. I was effectively denied the opportunity to maintain my anatomical skills, which are critical for my oral practical exam preparation on June 26 at noon with Dr. Jonas Barna.

EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS APPEAL _ DISSECTION BAN and EU Hungarian law violation The limited “consultation opportunities” provided during the exam period were insufficient to compensate for this gap in training. Without routine access to supervised dissection, proper instruction, and preparation time, my chances of success were severely hindered. This withholding of access contradicts fundamental academic values, violates EU guidelines for educational equity, and constitutes an abuse of administrative discretion. It also violates the principles set forth under Hungarian education statutes concerning non-discriminatory treatment of enrolled students.

Legal Reference - Article XI of the Hungarian Constitution

This practice contradicts Article XI of the fundamental law of Hungary, which guarantees equal access to education and professional training for all students.

EU Charter of Fundamental Rights - Article 14: Right to Education - Important References that I cited from-

Link (official EUR-Lex):

Key Language from Article 14(1):

"Everyone has the right to education and access to vocational and continuing training."

EU Education and Training Rights Overview:

I respectfully request the following: • Immediate investigation into the administrative conduct of the Head of Anatomy Department. I respectfully request a formal review of Dr. Szekely's conduct, reinstatement of supervised access for affected FM students, and institutional assurance that similar exclusion will not occur again. • Full reinstatement of my right to attend dissection reviews or supervised labs if I have to CV 2 Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 FM2 2 • In the future, there should be the removal of any preconditions for participation in educational activities. — Asking me to revoke my signature so that I can attend the practical dissections. • An official response within seven working days. • A review of institutional compliance with EU and Hungarian constitutional education guarantees. Should this matter remain unresolved, I reserve the right to file a formal complaint with the Hungarian Ombudsman and escalate the

case to the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport, and Culture. I hope for a fair and transparent resolution. Sincerely, Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

AXEMG8

First year second semester - English medicine program

Exhibit A: Semmelweis University Medical Student (English Program) Monday, July 28, 2025 at 12:43:26 Monday, July 28, 2025 at 12:43:26 Monday, July 28, 2025 at 12:43:26 PM Central European Summer Time PM Central European Summer Time PM Central European Summer Time PM Central European Summer Time

Subject: Subject: Subject: Subject: Re: Formal Appeal to Semmelweis University – Violation of Educational Rights: Request for Institutional

Review - Anatomy Department

Date: Thursday, June 26, 2025, at 3:32:33 PM Central European Summer Time

From: From: From: From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN

To: Horváth Balázs (egyetemi esélyegyenl■ségi koordinátor)

Attachments: Attachments: Attachments: Attachments: image001.png, image002.jpg

Dear Mr. Horváth,

Thank you for getting back to me.

Your role as the University Equal Opportunity Coordinator directly relates to the issue I raised. My complaint concerns the denial of supervised dissection access and unfair preconditions set by the Anatomy

Department, which I believe violate both Hungarian constitutional law (Article XI) and the EU Charter of

Fundamental Rights (Article 14). These laws guarantee equal access to vocational and professional

training for all students, regardless of their administrative status.

As the Equal Opportunity O■cer, your role includes:

• Ensuring Fair Academic Practices

• Examining Institutional Inequalities and Barriers

• Protecting Educational Access Rights Under EU and Hungarian Laws

Since I was excluded from in-person dissection labs without a valid academic or legal

reason — and was told to revoke my previous signatures to attend class — this clearly falls

under your jurisdiction.

I am therefore requesting:

1. Your o■cial acknowledgment of this situation as an Equal Opportunity concern.

2. Your support in initiating a review of the department’s exclusionary practices.

3. A confirmation that no further preconditions will be imposed on my future registrations that restrict access to labs or lectures without a formal justification.

I have already cited the relevant legal and human rights articles in my original message. Should this issue remain unresolved, I will escalate it to:

• The Hungarian Ombudsman for Education

• The European Commission Directorate-General for Education

• And notify the U.S. Embassy’s Education Attaché, as I am a U.S. citizen, EU citizen, and Irish citizen

I'm eager to hear back from you within seven (7) days, as stated in my original appeal. If I have misunderstood your role, please kindly direct me to the proper o■cial responsible for investigating violations of equal access to education at Semmelweis University.

Sincerely yours,

Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

AXEM69 – First Year, Second Semester

Semmelweis University – English Medical Program

1 of 6Get Outlook for iOS

From: Horváth Balázs (egyetemi esélyegyenl■ségi koordinátor)

<horvath.balazs@semmelweis.hu>

Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:22:33 PM

To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu>

Subject: RE: Formal Appeal to Semmelweis University – Violation of Educational Rights:

Request for Institutional Review - Anatomy Department

Dear Siddharta!

Could you help me figure out what this has to do with me?

Sincerelly Yours,

HORVÁTH BALÁZS

EGYETEMI ESÉLYEGYENL■SÉGI KOORDINÁTOR

SEMMELWEIS EGYETEM

JOGI ÉS IGAZGATÁSI F■IGAZGATÓSÁG

1085 Budapest, Baross utca 52.

+36 20 825 8426

horvath.balazs@semmelweis.hu

Response Received:

Horváth Balázs replied: 'Could you help me figure out what this has to do with me?'

Get

From: Horváth Balázs (egyetemi esélyegyenl■ségi koordinátor) <> Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 4:06:22 PM To: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <> Subject: RE: Formal Appeal to Semmelweis University – Violation of Educational Rights: Request for Institutional Review - Anatomy Department

Dear Siddharta!

Are you aware of the Hungarian legal environment?

Sincerelly Yours,

From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN <> Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 3:50:50 PM To: Rector Bela Merkely <>; Rektorhelyettes <>; ÁOK Dékáni Hivatal - Titkárság <>; ASZFI - Titkárság <>; Student Services <>; Horváth Balázs (egyetemi esélyegyenl■ségi koordinátor) <> Subject: Re: Formal Appeal to Semmelweis University – Violation of Educational Rights: Request for Institutional Review - Anatomy Department

Student ID: AXEMG8 | Faculty of Medicine

Dear [Madam / Sir / Registrar's Name],

I am following up on my previous correspondence regarding unresolved issues involving:

Denial of access to dissection labs despite paid enrollment and valid course registration

Obstruction of final exam participation without a clear justification

Contradictory communication from the Registrar and the Academic Department

Procedural inconsistency and lack of transparency are affecting my academic rights

To date, I have not received an adequate response or remedy. Given the lack of resolution, I have formally submitted a complaint to:

The Hungarian Commissioner for Fundamental Rights (Case ID: EBF–AJBH–309–2025)

The European Union Directorate-General for Education and Culture via the standard complaint procedure

For your transparency and institutional record, I have attached:

My official complaint was filed with the EU Directorate

The reply from the Hungarian Ombudsman

Relevant emails and administrative documents reflecting the contradictions and procedural failures

Why This Matters

This is no longer an internal academic grievance—it now concerns:

Violation of EU Charter Article 14 on education access

Breach of standards under Erasmus+ and EU-aligned medical education frameworks

Potential discrimination against international students through administrative obstruction

Institutional conduct potentially inconsistent with Hungarian higher education law

Request

I urge the university to:

Please provide a written clarification on my current standing and remaining academic obligations

Confirm that I will not be subjected to further penalty or denial of access without due process

State clearly whether my course and exam rights remain valid for the upcoming semester

I am fully prepared to cooperate, but I expect institutional accountability and transparent communication in return.

Thank you for your time and attention. This matter can be resolved constructively.

Sincerely, Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan U.S. and E.U. Citizens Semmelweis University | Faculty of Medicine
■ ■

Monday, July 28, 2025 at 12:45:07 Monday, July 28, 2025 at 12:45:07 Monday, July 28, 2025 at 12:45:07 PM Central European Summer Time PM Central European Summer Time PM Central European Summer Time PM Central European Summer Time

Subject: Subject: Subject: Subject: Date: Date: Date: Date: To: To: To: To: Final Legal Reminder – Court Petition Filed and Whistleblower Protection Activated

Saturday, July 5, 2025 at 5:12:43 PM Central European Summer Time

From: Siddhartha HARSH WARDHAN

Rector Bela Merkely, Rektorhelyettes, ÁOK Dékáni Hivatal - Titkárság, ASZFI - Titkárság, Student Services,

Horváth Balázs (egyetemi esélyegyenl■ségi koordinátor)

Attachments: Attachments: Attachments: Attachments: IMG_2074.jpeg

Dear Semmelweis University Officials,

This is a final legal notice regarding my previously submitted formal complaints, ignored

petitions, and repeated denials of lawful access to educational resources despite my valid CV/FM registration. As of July 5, 2025, I have filed a formal legal petition with the Hungarian Administrative Court and submitted a protected whistleblower disclosure under Act XXV of 2023 via the secure national system. My complaint is also registered with the Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights under Case No. EBF-AJBH-309-2025.

I am now under whistleblower legal protection, and I remind you that any further obstruction, denial, retaliation, or academic interference may constitute a legal violation of Act XXV, Hungarian Administrative Law (Act CL of 2016), or the university's own SZMSZ_HKR regulations.

I respectfully request a formal institutional response, acknowledgment of my current academic status, and reinstatement of my educational access immediately. Any failure to comply may be presented in court as evidence of institutional negligence or discrimination.

Sincerely,

Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu

U.S. Citizen | EU Citizen (Irish) | Resident of Budapest

+36 703 504 077

Legal Reference:

WFME Standard 3.1.1 mandates that governance mechanisms must ensure accountability and transparency in communication.

ESG 1.8 stipulates that public information requires institutions to publish and respond transparently to policies and decisions related to students.

Act CL of 2016 on Administrative Procedure, 33 & 35, requires institutions to reply within statutory deadlines and to provide reasons for their decisions.

The EU Charter, Article 41, affirms the right to good administration.

There is an explicit cross-reference to Appendices A- G, framing this timeline as a documented record that demonstrates a continuing pattern of violations.

This appendix documents the explicit age-based preference articulated in the official admissions documents of Semmelweis University, which contravenes Hungarian anti-discrimination law (Act CXXV of 2003, Section 8) and infringes upon the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights (Article 21).

This policy offers an institutional context for the discriminatory treatment faced by the whistleblower. It helps establish a pattern of systemic exclusion, mainly affecting older FM/CV students who are disproportionately impacted by informal and undocumented administrative policies.

1. Evidence from the Semmelweis University Admissions Policy

Official Admission Document (2023–2024): “Applicants must be at least 18 years of age by the end of the calendar year of application, and preferably under the age of 30.” Source: https://semmelweis.hu/admission/files/2022/11/admission-rules-semmelweis-university-year-2023-2024.pdf

Official Admission Document (2025–2026): “Applicants must be at least 18 years of age … and preferably under the age of 30.” Source: https://semmelweis.hu/registrar/files/2024/12/admission-rules-semmelweis-university-year-2025-2026.pdf

2. Legal Framework Violated

• Hungarian Act CXXV of 2003 on Equal Treatment – Section 8 • Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union – Article 21(1) • Directive 2000/78/EC – General Framework for Equal Treatment in Employment and Occupation These collectively prohibit unjustified discrimination based on age in educational access and public service delivery.

3. Relevance to the Whistleblower Complaint

This discriminatory language, although presented as a preference, establishes a definitive institutional bias against students aged over 30. This bias directly correlates with the treatment received by the whistleblower, whose rights were impeded while registered under FM/CV status. It reinforces the assertion that arbitrary age-related filtering has been ingrained within both formal and informal administrative practices.

4. Request for Institutional Review

This appendix is submitted as part of Case EBF–AJBH–309–2025 and Court File 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2. We respectfully request: 1. Removal or amendment of all discriminatory age-related preferences from Semmelweis University’s public documentation. 2. Investigation by the Equal Treatment Authority and Hungarian Ombudsman into implicit age bias across departments. 3. Confirmation that no internal policy legally justifies academic exclusion based on age above 30.

Hungarian Law

Act CXXV of 2003 on Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities (Ebktv.) – § 8 explicitly prohibits discrimination on the grounds of age, nationality, and “other status” in education, including indirect discrimination where a neutral criterion disproportionately disadvantages a group

Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education – § 1 and § 3 guarantee equal access and forbid any unjustified differential treatment in admission, study rights, or academic progression, including based on age

EU & International Law

Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union prohibits “any discrimination based on any ground such as… age” in the scope of EU law, which includes higher education under the European Higher Education Area.

Directive 2000/78/EC establishes a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation. It has been extended in CJEU case law to cover vocational training and access to professional qualifications, which includes medical education.

Directive 2019/1937/EU (EU Whistleblowing Directive) – protects individuals who report breaches of Union law, including violations of non-discrimination provisions.

European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the EHEA (ESG 1.3 & 1.4) – require fair, consistent, and non-discriminatory application of rules for all students.

This appendix G outlines the administrative obstruction imposed upon Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan by a faculty member at Semmelweis University in February 2025, which effectively halted his academic progression in the General Medicine program.

Summary of the Event.

In February 2025, Dr. Andrea Dorottya Székely issued an informal and unregulated declaration that prohibited the student from engaging in the practical sessions of 'Macroscopic Anatomy & Embryology II,' despite the student's fulfillment of attendance and prerequisite criteria. This decision was not founded upon any stipulation or regulation codified in the Semmelweis University Study and Examination Regulations (SZMSZ), Hungarian legislation, or European Union education law.

2. Curriculum Impact

The obstruction of 'Macroscopic Anatomy & Embryology II' effectively halted the researcher's progress after Year 1, as this course serves as a stringent prerequisite for subsequent coursework.

- Microscopic Anatomy & Embryology II

- Medical Physiology I & II

- Pathology I

- Multiple Year 2 and Year 3 core clinical courses

Without completion of this course, academic progression is impossible under the Semmelweis curriculum, regardless of performance in other subjects.

3. Legal Significance

This obstruction constitutes an unlawful administrative action under multiple legal frameworks: - Article 21 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (prohibition of discrimination) - Protocol 1, Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (Right to Education) - Directive 2013/55/EU on the recognition of professional qualifications (transparency and fairness) - Hungarian Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education (requirement for codified rules)

4. Consequences

The administrative decision led to the annulment of the 2024/2025 academic year, as the student was unable to register for dependent Year 2 courses in Fall 2025. This has significantly affected professional development, the timeline for degree completion, and future career prospects.

5. Evidence

Evidence substantiating this claim is included in Appendix C of the legal escalation dossier, comprising: - Official correspondence documenting the obstruction - Absence of any relevant clause in the SZMSZ - Neptun records indicate eligibility for the course, yet no exam registration is permitted

This document may be utilized in European Union educational legal case studies, ombudsman filings, and court submissions to exhibit targeted administrative obstruction.

Hungarian Educational Laws

Hungarian Law Citations Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education (Magyar Közlöny 2011/165, as amended), § 49(1)(b), §

56(1), § 108(1)–(2). Act XXV of 2023 on Complaints and Whistleblower Protection (Magyar Közlöny 2023/47), §§ 3–5, 8, 12, 15. Act CL of 2016 on General Public Administration Procedures (Magyar Közlöny 2016/210), §§ 1–3, 37–39,50.

Act CXXV of 2003 on Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities (Magyar Közlöny 2003/66), § 8(1), § 10(a)–(c).

EU Law & Policy Citations:

Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union [2012] OJ C326/391, arts 21, 47.

Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of the European Parliament and of the Council of October 23, 2019, on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law [2019] OJ L305/17.

Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of September 7, 2005, on the recognition of professional qualifications [2005] OJ L255/22.

Quality Assurance Standards

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) (2015 edn), Standards 1.3, 1.4, 1.6.

Academic & Empirical Studies

Gabriella Pusztai, Zsuzsanna Demeter-Karászi, Erika Alter, and Ferenc Szabó, ‘Administrative Data Analysis of Student Attrition in Hungarian Medical Training’ (2022) 22 BMC Medical Education 317 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03276-z>.

Nikiforos P Diamandouros, The Role of the Ombudsman in Strengthening the Rule of Law and Democracy (2014) 14 ERA Forum 311.

Gábor Attila Tóth, ‘The Role of the Ombudsman in the Protection of Fundamental Rights in Hungary’ in Linda C Reif (ed), The International Ombudsman Yearbook (vol 16, Brill 2012) 49.

Zoltán Szente, ‘The Ombudsman’s Role in Protecting Fundamental Rights in Hungary’ (2015) 3 Hungarian Journal of Legal Studies 56.

Semmelweis University Internal Regulation Citation

Semmelweis University, Organizational and Operational Regulations – Part III, Chapter III.2: Study and Examination Regulations (English translation, 2024 edn), arts 5, 11, 13, 29, 45, 55.

Act XXV of 2023 on Complaints and Whistleblower Protection (Hungary).

Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education (Hungary).

Act CL of 2016 on General Administrative Procedure (Hungary).

[SEMMELWEIS UNIVERSITY] Study and Examination Regulations (SZMSZ_HKR_III_KONYV_III_2_RESZ, 2024 Edition).

Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2012/C 326/02), Articles 21 and 47.

European Higher Education Area (EHEA) Mobility and Recognition Guidelines.

Hungarian Ombudsman Case File: EBF–AJBH–309–2025.

Hungarian Administrative Court Filing: Case No. 7. Kpk. 750.239/2025/2.

Wardhan, S.H. (2025). Administrative Obstruction in EU Medical Education: A Legal Case Study from [SEMMELWEIS UNIVERSITY]. SSRN.

[SEMMELWEIS UNIVERSITY] (2024). Internal Neptun Records and Course Registration Logs [published Evidence Files].

Wardhan, S. H. (2025). Administrative Obstruction in EU Medical Education: A Legal Case Study from Semmelweis University. SSRN.

Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union [2012] OJ C326/02, arts 14, 21, 47.

European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015), Stds 1.4, 1.6 https://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf accessed August 14, 2025.

WFME, Standards for Basic Medical Education: WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement (2015), Stds 3.1, 3.4 https://wfme.org/standards/ accessed 14 August 2025.

ECFMG, 2024 Accreditation Guidance for International Medical Schools https://www.ecfmg.org/accreditation/ accessed 14 August 2025.